DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 588 HE 000 796

By-Pulver, Glen C.; And Others

The Role of the University in Community Development.

Adult Education Association of U.S.A., Washington, D.C.; Association of Univ. Evening Colleges, Norman, Okla.; National Univ. Extension Association, Minneapolis, Minn.

Pub Date 69

Note-44p.; Papers presented at annual Mid-Continent Conference of 3 regional associations, University of Missouri, Columbia, January 12-14, 1969

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30

Descriptors-*Community Development, Community Involvement, Extension Agents, *Higher Education, Systems Approach, *Urban Areas, *Urban Extension, *Urban Universities

Identifiers-*Title I

At the Mid-Continent Conference on "The Role of the University in Community Development," 3 major papers were presented. In the first, Glen C. Pulver dealt with urban problems and used Milwaukee, Wisconsin as an example to illustrate the complexities of modern metropolitan life. Because communication among various groups in the city is necessary for finding solutions, the university needs a wide array of specialists committed to developing trust between its programs and services and those it wants to reach. The experience of University Extension's involvement in the development of Milwaukee has demonstrated the need for the urban university to engage in critical self-examination. Daniel J. Schler discusses the meaning of community development, the concept of a university's role, the problems of assuming new functions and relationships, the nature of the university itself, and the proper institutional responses to community needs. Lee J. Cary cites Title I as indicative of the shift from a project to problem focus--a move toward a comprehensive systems approach to community problems. He believes community development is an appropriate way for the university to address social needs, and the state universities have a special responsibility to serve the people of their state. Discussion of the University of Missouri's extension program indicates the need for more professionals in the field and the broad scope of possible community action. (JS)

ED029588

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Glen C. Pulver
Daniel J. Schler
Lee J. Cary

Three papers presented at the Mid-Continent Conference
University of Missouri - Columbia
January 12-14, 1969

School of Social and Community Services
and the
University Extension Division
University of Missouri - Columbia

HE 000 796

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Glen C. Pulver
Daniel J. Schler
Lee J. Cary

School of Social and Community Services
and the
University Extension Division
University of Missouri - Columbia

FOREWORD

The Mid-Continent Conference was held at the University of Missouri - Columbia on January 12-14, 1969. This was an annual meeting of regional organizations of the National University Extension Association, the Association of University Evening Colleges, and the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. Theme for the Conference was "The Role of the University in Community Development." The three major papers were presented by Dr. Glen C. Pulver, Dean, Division of Human Resource Development, University Extension, University of Wisconsin; Dr. Daniel J. Schler, Director, Bureau of Community Services, University of Colorado, Boulder; and Dr. Lee J. Cary, Professor and Chairman, Department of Regional and Community Affairs, University of Missouri - Columbia. The papers are published in this monograph for distribution to the Conference participants and others interested in the role of the university in community development.

Edwin P. Banks
Conference Chairman
University of Colorado

The Role of the University in Community Development: An Urban Experience

Glen C. Pulver
University of Wisconsin

Today's society is filled with glaring contrasts which have led to a crisis of contradiction. In spite of our wealth, nearly one out of five American families live in poverty. Expanded technology has brought more free time than ever before and yet, there are 20,000 suicides a year and over three million Americans receive psychiatric care. Everyone knows the value of education, and still 25 per cent of our young people "drop out" before completing high school. The country claims an excellent legal system, but the poor and racial minorities are subjected to injustice. Scientists can guide complicated spacecraft to the moon and back, but can't design an economic, political and social structure which adequately feeds all our children.

Although obviously not restricted to urban settings, these contradictions become more evident in those places where people concentrate. Poverty stands next to wealth, ignorance next to academia, air pollution next to electronic genius, and individual freedom next to political repression.

Milwaukee shares the characteristics of most urban settings. The most significant is the fact that the city is composed of multiple power pyramids. These institutions have thousands of people at the base and a few power figures at the top. It is through decision by these power figures that action aimed at meeting the needs of the people does or does not take place in the city.

The Milwaukee metropolitan complex is in actuality the city itself plus eighteen other cities and villages in the county. In addition there are ten other cities and villages in four other counties. Many metropolitan complexes have the added complication of including more than one state. Each city, village, and county has its own peculiar combination of governmental structures. It is difficult for the average citizen to know in which sewerage district, school administration, park district, and police and fire protection district he is located. He may travel through several street systems each day on his way to work. When a local public service is not performed properly, it is hard to know where to contact the appropriate governmental official.

In large urban complexes the distance from the bottom to the top of most of the power pyramids is long. There are about 744,000 people in the city of Milwaukee itself. It is the eleventh largest city in the United States. There are over 1,450,000 people in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. How then can the individual citizen hope to communicate with the mayor of his city or other elected or appointed officials so that he can feel confident that his views are adequately represented? In recent years in many urban communities, there has been a reduction

in the number of elected representatives in the name of governmental efficiency. Although more efficient, the citizen is one step further removed from the top of the pyramid.

The political power pyramids are not the only places where the individual feels a sense of loss of individual worth and influence. All too often he or she may be little more than desk 84 in a huge office or a serial number in a factory. The employer doesn't know him nor does he know the employer.

The feeling of need for participation in the decisions which affect their lives has forced urban dwellers to organize community organizations. The growth in the number of these organizations has been phenomenal. A recent study indicated that there are approximately 600 in Milwaukee's inner city ghetto alone. These organizations are struggling mightily to gain a stronger voice in the decision making in their community.

Another critical characteristic of the great metropolitan areas of the country is the mobility of their population. The average citizen moves every five years. The city dweller is apt to move even more often. Over twenty years ago white city residents began the great migration to the suburbs. Shortly afterward, large numbers of rural residents began moving into the central cities. A large portion of these immigrants were black and from the rural South. Today there are over 90,000 black people concentrated in the inner city of Milwaukee. They have come to the city with poorer basic educations and with little understanding of the complex maze of city institutions. They have faced a strange culture which has usually been unfriendly. The institutional maze is equally

confusing for the some 18,000 Spanish speaking people who have also come to Milwaukee. They bear the added burden of a language barrier. How then do these citizens find their way into the proper pyramid and to the top in order to acquire proper street lighting, trash pickup, snow removal, police protection and dozens of other services critical in an area of high population concentration?

The city runs on a day-to-day basis guided by a complicated set of interrelated institutions. These institutions may, at times, prevent the kind of action desired by most of the people and the power structure, but may be difficult to update. Conflicting goals, conceptions, values, personal interests, and political relationships, and dozens of other things make change difficult. For example--in an effort to isolate the Police Department from political bossism and gangsterism, some Police Chiefs have essentially life-time appointments. The result of this kind of structure in Milwaukee has been a city with a relatively small amount of organized crime. On the other hand, there have been many complaints about insensitivity by the Police to the problems and aspirations of the growing number of black people in Milwaukee. The complainants feel that the insulation of the position of Police Chief prevents resolution of this concern.

The multiple power pyramids, the lengthening distance from bottom to the top of the pyramids, the highly mobile population, and the accompanying complexity of institutions has generated a major problem in communication. There are growing gaps in communication in the city between employers and employees, city officials and the man on the street, white neighbor and black neighbor, the county courthouse and

city hall. These gaps cause further frustration because of an absence of participation and an apparent lack of understanding. The power which exists, the Mayor for example, may try to respond to the peoples' needs but may not respond properly or be misinterpreted in his response. The pure weight of massive bureaucracy may prevent a proper response. The elected officials' views may be clouded by the bureaucrat and vice versa.

In a real effort to demand communication, some citizens have resorted to violence. Although violence is hard to condone under any circumstance, it must be recognized as a means of communication. A communication which says, "Look, you can't ignore me any longer! You've got to pay attention! I have some needs which must be met and some ideas about how to meet them! Stop shutting me out!"

Within the city, communication takes place most effectively between people of common concerns be they residence, profession, church, or employment. Communication takes place through confidences. So it is, that professionals talk to professionals, doctors to doctors, engineers to engineers, educators to educators, churchmen to churchmen, politicians to politicians, the poor to the poor.

A university which hopes to develop an effective program of community development must recognize the critical importance of existing communication patterns and confidences. There is a great need for catalytic action to stimulate communication between the many groups but this is extremely difficult without first developing sufficient confidence to be able to enter each of the groups. The city possesses a large number of comparatively narrow groups with high degree

of specialization. To be effective in the city, the university then must also possess a relatively wide array of specialists committed to outreach and confidence building.

The University Extension approach to community development in Milwaukee has been broadly based. A few examples will provide a general idea of the method of operation:

-- The Institute of Governmental Affairs is a department composed largely of Political Scientists. Their objective is to improve state and local governmental administration. Last year the Institute brought city and county government officials together in a course on Public Administration. This was the first series of common meetings by these officials in many years.
-- The University Extension Department of Commerce through its contacts with businessmen in Milwaukee has run a series of educational programs in business management for Negro businessmen in the inner city.
-- The County Extension Agents have built up strong confidences with county government through a history of working contacts. The county officials feel that the agents are responsive to their needs. As a consequence, the agents have developed a number of educational programs aimed at park and recreational development, community beautification, and job training programs for the unemployed with the support of the County Public Welfare officials.
-- Close confidences between the University

Extension Department of Social Work and the Social Development Commission resulted in a New Careers Training Program for people in social service agencies and an aide training program for the aging.

-- The School for Workers has introduced lengthy discussions of city and racial problems in education programs with labor union leaders.

-- The City Health Department participated in a joint program with the Department of Nursing aimed at demonstrating the importance of adequate pre-natal care. The demonstration was successful and as a consequence the Health Department has instituted a new and significant pre-natal care program.

-- Very few institutions have built effective confidences with the inner city poor. This includes the university. In an effort to open communication and develop confidence, the Center for Community Leadership Development employed a number of Community Representatives at the block level. These people were employed on a part-time basis and from the community. This was not so that the University might talk to the community, but so that the people of the inner city might express their needs and wishes to the University. This effort has been immensely successful. Special sensitivity programs for teachers and employers have resulted. The public schools have assumed ongoing responsibility for the training of teachers in

black history and other special concerns of ghetto schools. The Center is training trainers for private industry sensitivity programs in cooperation with the Urban League. A model volunteer tutor program and many other positive programs have resulted.

These are only a few of many examples which might be presented of University Extension's involvement in the development of Milwaukee. The point is that all of these educational programs have been developed through contacts and confidences developed with many specialized groups throughout the city; doctors with doctors, businessmen with businessmen and the poor with people who know and understand them. Communication barriers have been lowered.

In recent weeks arguments have been raised at the national level against direct citizen involvement in program development. The argument has been made that if a person is very ill, he shouldn't try to diagnose and resolve his own sickness. Instead he should ask a skilled doctor to prescribe a proper cure. Thus, the argument continues--poor people cannot know what is best for them. They, too, should seek the answers to their problems from the experts. This kind of argument must be examined with great care. Advice of the experts is absolutely necessary in dealing positively and efficiently with urban problems, but the people must be involved in great detail if their needs and problems are to be honestly understood. All too often, the doctors dealing with urban illnesses do not consult at length with the patient before prescribing a cure. Diagnosis is by observation at a distance and prescription of panaceas by telephone.

Those people most directly concerned with community development must insure the continued growth of citizen involvement in program development if real change is to occur in urban areas. In simplest terms, the doctor-patient relationship must be improved.

The University Extension experience in Milwaukee has taught us many things. Most critical has been the fact that the university cannot hope to be a significant influence in an urban setting unless it is willing to examine itself critically. A series of questions are generated by this involvement. They are tough questions.

-- Are we willing to accept the present "system" or will we recognize and deal with the need for institutional change?
-- Are we prepared to study and understand the historical roles of protest and violence in social change? This is not a request to accept violence but to understand why it occurs.
-- Are we serious about reaching the unreached in our society? Can we dialogue honestly with people holding unfamiliar value systems?
-- Can we design and provide an avenue for resolution of societal conflict?
-- Are we prepared to support those faculty members who risk educational involvement in community concerns?
-- Are we prepared to commit the necessary financial resource support to provide a large number of university-based specialties?

A great challenge is placed before the modern university. The challenge is to deal honestly and directly with the serious conflicts of our urban and rural society. Society is crying out for help in resolution of today's problems through logical thought and action rather than as a reaction to discomforts and pressure. The challenge to the university is to join with the community in the development of logical yet rapid paths to the solution of our community problems. This is the specific challenge to all community development specialists.

The Role of the University in Community Development: An Examination of Three Concepts

Daniel J. Schler
University of Colorado

Having been directly involved for the past year and a half in attempting to create a framework for both community problem-solving in a number of urban settings, and simultaneously evolving a role for some members of the university to play in such enterprises, I welcome this opportunity to reflect upon the subject of the role of the university in community development.

My only apprehension is the scope of the topic and the elusive nature of the three concepts--university, role and community development. Almost anyone would be hard put to give definitive statements of what constitutes a university, what social scientists or laymen mean by role, and especially what community development is all about! Only after responding to the invitation to make some comments on the role of the university in community development did I fully realize how naive I was to accept such a commitment. It did at least one thing for me, it helped me realize how presumptuous I was to accept a job to involve a university in community development in Colorado nearly two years ago.

I have also been somewhat at a lost as to the best approach to take on a topic of this kind at this

institution where for at least ten years attempts have been made by a part of the university to play various roles in community development, both at home and abroad. I have wondered if my remarks should be complimentary, friendly, polished, scholarly, gentile, critical, insulting, or abrasive! Should an attempt be made to gloss over issues, or in contemporary jargon "tell it like it is." No doubt you will find a little bit of all of this in my presentation. However, my intentions are analytical and perscriptive. I would like to be analytical about what it means for a university to be involved in community development, and perscriptive from my point of view of how to proceed.

First of all, we could raise the question as to the rationale, or reason for the involvement of universities in community development. This question could be debated for many hours. I am going to proceed with the assumption that there is a rationale, a justification, for universities to take a role and perform a function in community development. However, I would call to your attention the fact that this is not assumed by all faculty members and much interpretation of why and how this is done is currently needed. With them as with other people, one of the best ways to be convincing is to get out and do things, to demonstrate the how, what and why.

My assumption that the university should be involved in community development is built on three primary premises which constitute the major content of my discussion. First, community development is preceded and accompanied by learning experiences on the part of people who take action in the public interest toward local system development. In other

words, community development is a learned phenomenon. Second, there has been, is, and will be in the future a need for formal, organized learning experiences which provide individuals with the predisposition and competence to engage in community development. Third, the purpose of educational institutions has been to serve the educational needs of society, with the present urgency to give attention to the intelligent operation and evolution of a rapidly changing social order. In this context, community development, appears to me to be the biggest undertaking that educational institutions have ever been challenged to become a part of, and sometimes I am not quite sure if the university is up to it.

After having stated these premises, it appears to me that some discussion of what community development is all about is warranted in order to know what it is that we are trying to get universities to do. Having some first-hand experience with the literature and the field of action, I can assure you that much has been said and written on community development. This ranges from abstract definitions to detailed explanations of the real world activities of those who say they are doing community development, and are involved in a discrete activity, project, program, process, or movement which they define as such. To refresh our memory, I would like to refer to the sociologist Irwin Sanders' diverse definitions and perspectives on community development:

> Some social scientists think of community development as a <u>process</u> and focus upon the sequences through which communities (or their segments) go as they...change: others who are action, rather than research-oriented, think of community development as a <u>method</u> to be

> used in moving toward their objectives. They do not lose sight of the fact that processes are involved, but they focus upon accomplishments rather than upon sequences. With the third grouping community development means a program that has been carefully thought through in terms of content as well as procedures. The stress here is upon activities as set forth in the program, and the program itself becomes the objective. A fourth view... is that community development is a movement... a special kind of program that holds unusual promise and one worthy of unabashed commitment...[1]

Another community sociologist, Roland Warren, defines community development as "a deliberate and sustained attempt to strengthen the horizontal pattern of the community."[2] As such, Warren perceives community development as a process. It is not particularly a method for reaching certain extraneous objectives, such as a new playground, or industrial development, nor a program emphasizing a set of specific activities. It does carry overtones of a social movement to establish stronger local decision-making and action, accompanied by an assumption of resulting intentional integration of the various subsystems of the community.

One other definition is particularly relevant to our discussion and that is given by an adult educator, Jack Mezirow. He defines the community development process as "a planned and organized effort to assist individuals to acquire the attitudes, skills, and concepts required for their democratic participation in the effective solutions of as wide a range of community improvement problems as possible in an order of priority determined by their increasing levels of competence."[3] From Mezirow's point of view, community development is primarily an educational process.

Not without credit to all the testimonials and literature on the subject, I have to admit that every time I become engrossed in examining this phenomenon; its facts, myths, and expansive philosophy, I become bogged down in a jungle of morass. Part of this confusion is due to an attempt to relate the often simplistic definitions of community development to our complex, urban, industrial society; its multitude of structures and processes, and the changes which are constantly occurring in them. To a great extent, community development as it has been conceived and developed, does not fit our present culture, and must be refashioned and adapted if it is going to work to any major benefit--especially in urban areas!

We must take into account that community development obtained its generic elements from the early rural and small town life of this country and became a recognized area of work, goal, and procedure in developing countries after World War II. In those countries the setting for activity was primarily small rural villages. The goals were pretty clear--speed up the processes of modernization and get slow-changing traditional, gemeinshaft-type communities to accept new ideas, new modes of leadership and organization, and adopt new forms of technology. In many areas of the world it meant replacing community isolation and solidarity with new fragmented formal organizations and extra community relationships. It was just the opposite of Warren's definition...the horizontal axis of the community was weakened (rather than strengthened) as a result of bureaucrats who managed the community through vertical systems of programs and resources extending to the national level.

The community development movement, likewise,

contained several value bases: (1) that the technical changes which have occurred in the Western world were good, and should occur the world over; (2) that capitalism and New England town hall democracy were the economic and political forms that all men wanted and should embrace wholeheartedly; and (3) furthermore, with just a little initiative and good will, all men of the world would eventually, not only pursue, but achieve life, liberty, prosperty, and, we could add, property.

And so, for another time in history, bands of secular missionaries invaded the serene and remote villages of the world to carry on intentional diffusion and acculturation processes. Thus, there existed the grand model of both what was to be achieved, and how this was to be done. The goal was to encourage change in traditional, stable, slow-changing societies and to do this through seeking the cooperation of those to be changed with those who suggested change.

There appears to be three primary conditions which make it difficult to get a cultural fit of that brand of community development in our present urban areas. First of all, the environment is quite different from that where community development has primarily been practiced. Order is less prevalent than change, and a special concern has been expressed by the majority community for stronger police control and law and order, with or without justice. Change is particularly fragmented, immediate-oriented, and often unplanned and unpredictable. Traditional authority has been put aside without the aid of community development agents. If there are any agents in the community agitating for change, they often are agents teaching revolution and violence.

Thus, from one point of view, a desired end or goal of community development has already occurred. Our society has been opened up to change and is changing. New and different challenges face us: (a) how to create a concensus among diverse values, power and interests; (b) how to create new or reform old institutions so that people who want change and will seek it can become a part of these systems; and (c) how to guide the desire for change into constructive channels.

The second condition making a cultural fit difficult is that the systems which would be our units of work are much larger, more complex, and have local and extra-community interrelationships. We are not starting from the simple and proceeding to the complex. We begin with the complex and the complexity increases. It is often difficult to get a firm grasp on the unit and its boundaries which should receive primary attention. These units are systems of larger systems and thus must be dealt with in relation to other subsystems and the larger whole of society. We have not had the will, nor do we seem to know how to deal with change and development in the massive urban community in any meaningful total system or holistic fashion.

Third, we are intellectually, socially and culturally confused regarding goals. We are somewhat at a standstill in terms of where we want to go. There is little concensus on: urban community values, the solution of social problems (especially the issues of integration or separation of minorities), the ecological organization of urban areas, the political organization of cities, and the technical direction we should pursue in developing hardware in the physical plant of the city.

These conditions do not leave us with a very inviting situation for involvement in urban development. One major conclusion that can be drawn is that at a time when the community is the setting for man's increased interdependence and reciprocal relations, urban human settlements appear to lack that much needed ingredient of cohesion and integration. Likewise, many areas lack the local leadership, organization, and vitality to meet the expectations of its increasing number of citizens. Without resorting to reductionism, I think it is becoming more and more obvious to students of the city that a basic problem of our time is the lack of individual, group and institutional competence to solve the most critical problems of a rapidly changing society and to plan and build integrated and well-functioning urban communities. The current urban crises issues are problems of people, their organizations, and the lack of competence to understand, plan, and act in concerted ways to maintain and constantly create viable, urban, human environments consisting of diversity, but having the need to maintain a unity of purpose and interrelated functions.

In other words, there has been a breakdown in community development. In this context, I would like to suggest an additional and one of my own definitions of community development with a behavioral-action orientation: community development is that behavior of acting units within a given localized area which increases the interaction, understanding, reciprocal relations, mutual support and the level and convenience of living among its members. It is <u>this kind</u> of behavior which is greatly lacking in our urban areas and it is the creating of <u>this kind</u> of behavior

which should be the primary role of universities in local settings...the stimulation, prompting, and assisting in creating the conditions which result in community development actions.

I would like to emphasize that what is often defined as community development is not such in essence. It is merely, but significantly, the staging, prompting, and conditioning which precedes and accompanies the actual behavior of acting units in society. Through teaching and preconditioning individuals, the central and primary role of universities is to do the basic work in preparing for what is the necessary behavior of community development. A second and supplementary role, often just as important, is the resources which are contributed by the university as part of society to the actual processes of change and improvement.

I would hasten to add that the difference in the situations between a rural and urban environment does not render community development irrelevant. Many of the conditions have parallels. The city is composed of numerous sub-cultures, separated not by space but by lack of communication and different values and interests. To relate to these diverse elements requires as much effort in understanding their values and organization, and in developing rapport as is necessary in an Indian, Asian or African village. In fact, much of the urban scene is a foreign culture to many people. Likewise, we still have the need for process, for staff to create linkage and build relationships for input into these various systems. And we still have the need for content specialists to relate to the various processes of urban development.

Let me briefly summarize what appears to me to

be the role of the university in community development. First of all, it is not the responsibility of the university to be the direct action system in community development. That, I believe, is the responsibility of leadership within the local setting. As such, the university is not a direct problem-solving community action system. Its role is: (1) to provide the learning experiences which will give people the predisposition and competence to engage in community development; (2) to provide people with opportunities to learn community development and to stimulate such behavior by carrying out, from time to time, demonstration projects; (3) to provide the monitoring and the evaluation of action to mirror for actors their behavior, accomplishments, successes, and failures; and (4) to provide content and research support as involved participants in specific urban and community development activities.

There are various situations in which these roles can be taken. First of all, we should not overlook the fact that much learning which leads to community development can occur right in the classroom, on the campus, or the classroom can be taken to the community. Second, we can seek out where there is some community development action and attempt to serve as an interested party and resource system to the action. Third, we can look for and become a part of our stirrings for action, or where action is taking place in unpredictable ways, attempt to transform the behavior of the actors into effective and constructive patterns. Finally, we can be the stimulus, or create the focus for action, and get other parties to join in a demonstration of how a specific issue can be intelligently explored, or a specific problem solved.

I would like to turn now to the concept of role. In social science literature, as in the world of laymen, role has been used in a number of ways, often without clear meaning. The two most common usages are role as a unit of society as defined by Ralph Linton,[4] and role-playing or role-taking as another name for social interaction as used by George H. Mead.[5] I see both of these definitions as relevant to our discussion, but with the latter having the greater significance to the dynamic relationship between the university and society.

In the first case, role emphasizes conformity, expectation and approval. It is the action side of status. To put expected or prescribed rights and duties into effect is to perform a role. Mead's use of role, however, focuses more on the interpretive aspects of role-making and role-taking. In his lectures at the University of Chicago, Mead set forth a theory in which society, the development of personality, and communication are interrelated and linked together. To be able to communicate is in Mead's famous phrase, to be able to "take the role of the other" toward one's own vocalizations and behavior. The stress, from this point of view, is on role-making and role-taking through the individual's interpretive process of specific or generalized social situations. Particularly the idea of role-taking shifts emphasis away from the simple process of enacting a prescribed role to devising a performance on the basis of an imputed other-role. The actor is not the occupant of a position for which there is always a neat set of rules, but a person who must act in the perspective supplied in part by his relationship to others whose actions reflect roles that he must identify. In some

social situations where expected behavior is not properly perceived by the actor, or the actor chooses to deviate from tradition, role conflict, or societal conflict is a possibility.

This is not the whole story related to the concept of role, but it takes us far enough, I hope, to interrelate these meanings for our purpose. One dimension of our involvement in community development can be related to the status and expected performance of educational institutions in society. From this vantage point, we can operate to gain societal acceptance for our commitments and resources for our programing in those areas where we have traditional legitimation.

The educator is accepted in such roles as researcher, consultant and trainer, and often performs as such under contract to the Departments of Agriculture, Health, Education and Welfare, Defense and other units of government. Extension personnel are expected to conduct credit and non-credit courses, conferences and seminars in communities for the "straining-striving" middle class. Often it is possible to move into other areas of programing by gradually expanding staff and program content.

However, we have to be sensitive to several factors on the part of some institutions. First, there may be little or no institutional tradition of public service. Second, we must take new environments into account, especially in the urban setting, and engage in role-making and role-taking relative to the specific social situation. Third, when we move into new relationships and penetrate areas where our legitimation is very thin, we must be prepared for negative responses from the establishment. Often

a state of confusion, distrust of educators, and the threat of resource limitation begins to develop when researchers, educators and extension personnel begin to shift their relationships and programing to new service units. My main point here is that this is predictable behavior and can be expected unless we do a great deal of "warm up" work with the parties most closely in communication with our work. Sometimes we do not have the time, the resources or the access to do this.

Often times these negative responses can serve as a mirror to indicate who and what interests we have been serving in the past. If we had traditionally been performing the role of social critic, helping the disadvantaged, using our position for social change, guided by reason and concern for humanity, and experimenting with new forms of social relationships for the common good, there is a very strong possibility that such an expectation would exist today for these kinds of roles. As we build in the future, we are challenged to make sure such a tradition develops and is maintained.

Our discussion would not be complete if we did not give some attention to what the university is today, and who it is that is to carry out the numerous roles that educational institutions can play in community development. First of all, we can no longer pretend that the university is a community of scholars, collectively pursuing knowledge in the general interest of society. S.D.S. at least has made that point, if nothing else! The university is a collection of individuals who often have little in common besides the physical buildings they use and the common enemies they must deal with; namely, students and the

governing board! Seriously, the university mirrors our society. It is a fragmented, often divided system of many parts, performing an array of functions, some of them contradictory (for example, research and development for defense and at the same time peace marches by faculty and students).

Much that the university has done and is doing is dysfunctional to community development. It analyzes, but seldom integrates or prescribes. It teaches specialization but fails to build links of communication between these worlds of knowledge and action. It serves the interests of special groups but finds little time or resources for defining the public good and calling attention to it. A prime example is what we have done to the small community through agriculture technology with little concern for economic development in rural towns and regions. Likewise we tractored the Negro, the small farmer and migrant off the farm without proper skills to survive in an urban environment only to find them less than one generation later rioting in the cities. This is the mixed blessing which universities have been parties to.

My main point in looking at the university is to call attention to the need to do more in community development than to expand the scope of programming to communities. We need to take a close look at our priorities, our resource commitments and activities and ask to what extent are the universities a part of the present problem of our specialized, disintegrated, ill-functioning communities.

From our experiences at the University of Colorado I would like to point to two major responses that universities need to make to be effective in urban

development. First of all, there is the need to develop systems of content relevant to the present and anticipated future urban problem of our society. This is a role that is central to the tradition of the academic community. It has been neglected because of the value and organizational systems of educational institutions and the limitation of resources imposed upon them by prior commitments to our past rural-agrarian society and, recently, to defense interest of this country. We must look at this issue clearly. We must face the facts that a defense budget is in the billions, the cooperative extension service is serving less than ten percent of our population with a budget of $225 million plus, while less than $10 million in Title I of the Higher Education Act is appropriated to prime the pump of higher education to deal with community service and community development. These are the kinds of conditions under which we must operate in trying to develop those content areas and outreach systems to deal with urban problems in our society. These are resource limitations we shall have to live with and work with as we strain to move educational institutions into a more relevant position in community development.

However, while realizing these limitations, we should not be stopped by them. We should get on with the business of getting a commitment from university administrators to support us in our efforts in development. Likewise, we must build a public clientele system which is interested in community development from a holistic perspective. But most of all, we need to start demonstrating that we can do some things that are beneficial to community problem solving.

This poses the basic problems in the urban setting of clarifying the specialized content needed and the manner of integration of this content in the real world situation for application.

I would like to suggest several dimensions of present content requirements as I confront them daily in the community. First, the hardware or technology of an urban, mobile, interdependent convenience-oriented, materialistic society is much needed. Second, inter-personal and inter-group relationship is the problem of tolerance of diversity and deviance and that of maintaining some general framework of values and relationships to assure the continuing and effective functioning of such a society. Third, we badly need to develop content that deals with the problem of "making a living" in an urban society. Fourth, we need a content in the area of the problem of legal structure and the provision of change and continuity within and between these units. Fifth, we need content to deal with the problem of resource allocation and intelligent use of resources now and in the future.

A second major response of educational institutions to urban needs is that of <u>making their educational resources available for community development in such a way that we increase the probability of their use and assure the autonomy of both the community and the university in such joint enterprise undertakings</u>. This means linking staff to those systems we have not penetrated before. Also, it means working cooperatively in coalitions and joint enterprises where we have only been observers before, and the willingness to develop "partnerships" with our neighbor educational institutions. Universities

should see it as being in their interest to work cooperatively with other state colleges, junior colleges, community colleges, elementary and secondary schools. The whole educational system of a state needs to work cooperatively on these issues and problems. The more there are in the field, the more likelihood for societal acceptance. Likewise, we need all the outreach and contact points possible to assure intentional community change by not only one large coordinating system of university extension service but by the many parts of the educational community. Often the services required for community development need to be closely related to the scene of action, with the generalist and the specialist working in a team relationship in a specific local setting for long periods of time. Content people can be found in all kinds of educational institutions, not just at the big state college or the land grant university.

What I have discussed here has been the philosophy, content and scope of our activity in Colorado as I have come to see it. We have had an urban focus. We have tried to create an identification as a unit concerned with urban problems and urban development. We put staff out in the community to listen. We have brought people in from the community for faculty to listen and learn. At the same time we have tried to help them understand their own problems better and what the university could possibly do to help resolve various issues and problems. We have tried to develop urban content and resource systems. We have attempted to demonstrate and test the methods of outreach and, finally, we have tried to become partners and advocates of constructive community change.

I would like to especially pay tribute to Dean Mack Easton and his staff for giving us a framework in terms of the way in which our Title I proposals were written so that we could engage in this kind of experiment. It was to me a fortunate experience to have gotten to know Dean Easton, and I am appreciative of his intelligence, and his concern for community development which enabled us to get a start in dealing with urban problems.

NOTES

[1]Irwin T. Sanders, "Theories of Community Development." Rural Sociology, 23, 1 (March, 1958), 4.

[2]Roland L. Warren, The Community in America. (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963), 324.

[3]J. D. Mezirow, "Community Development as an Educational Process." Community Development, National Training Laboratories Selected Reading Series, No. 4 (1961), 16.

[4]Ralph Linton, The Study of Man; An Introduction. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936).

[5]George H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist. Edited, with introduction, by Charles W. Morris (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934).

The Role of the University in Community Development: A Commitment to Participation With the Community

Lee J. Cary
University of Missouri - Columbia

D. Mack Easton, at Ann Arbor in April of 1967,[1] and Thurman J. White, at Miami Beach in July of 1968,[2] both spoke of the opportunities and challenges to the universities in programs which effect systems, attack community problems, and are comprehensive in their approach. Both Easton and White had particular reference to Title I of the Higher Education Act. Easton felt that Title I was potentially more important than the Smith-Lever Act although he gave full credit to the central role of agricultural extension in the rise of agricultural productivity since 1915 and its effect on the nation's economy. White too saw great possibility in Title I programs yet both saw potential failure not because of the limited funds available through Title I, not because of the lack of coordination at the state level, but because they questioned whether the universities were ready for Title I and its implications. As Easton stated, "We need someone to lead us from project-oriented thinking to problem-oriented thinking, from the approach by discipline or profession to the comprehensive approach."[3] White pointed out, "Title I programs must be conceived in a framework of planning

in which the community comes first. The academic interests of professors cannot, in this context, be the principle determinant of programs, even though they must not be lost as a treasured resource."[4]

It is common practice to criticize, to point out that what is being done is not enough or could be done better. It is easy to ignore the new and innovative activities presently underway in many of our universities and focus instead on our major shortcomings. This is not quite my intent. I would like to state quite simply three major assumptions and then go on to support these points with an assessment of the current situation. For examples, I will draw on some of the experience gained at the University of Missouri.

First, Title I of the Higher Education Act can be viewed as one recent and important example of a shift, a trend away from a project focus to a problem focus, from working with individuals and their needs to planning aimed at community problems, from campus-centered activity to community-centered activity. This suggests a comprehensive systems approach to community problems.

Second, while community development is not the sole answer or the only approach to be used by the university it does offer distinct possibilities as a way for the university to relate itself more realistically and relevantly to the community and its problems.

Third, while all universities have a responsibility that extends well beyond the campus, state universities carry an additional mandate to serve the people of their state. Someone has said, "A state university is like any other university except more

so." In this case, the "more so" is this additional mandate, this responsibility to serve.

James T. Bonnen, of Michigan State University, speaking at the University of Missouri Annual Extension Conference in October, 1968, cautioned his audience: "It is imperative that we recognize that we are moving from a period in which the university role in public affairs has been primarily one of creating technological change to a period in which the society is pressing increasingly for a conscious university effort to transform the social and economic institutions of the society. This is a very different world for university extension."[5] He went on to describe the breakdown in our ability to master community problem solving and decision making and pointed out that this breakdown testified to the fact that our ability to create technical change has outrun social invention to manage that change. The university, therefore, must expand its role in public affairs to a full-scale university commitment to societal problem solving.

Bonnen also pointed out "In research, in extension, and even in teaching, society is creating alternatives to the university. Thus, the inability or unwillingness of the university to do the kind of problem solving research needed by society has resulted in a great growth of governmental and private (profit and non-profit) research institutes..... The university faces the choice of taking some major responsibility for these functions in society or see other institutions build up around these social needs."[6]

Some would not view this possibility with alarm, letting others respond to societal needs. The argu-

ment goes something like this - the mission of the university is to create an intellectual community where a range of scholarly disciplines are committed to the generation, ordering and transmission of knowledge. Teaching and increasing knowledge through research become the two major pursuits. The outreach of the university, the application of knowledge to the specific situation holds a lower priority. While I would not strongly disagree with this view, we should be concerned here with a matter of emphasis. How much or how little attention is focused on responding to societal needs.

What we have is an increasing need for, and pressure for, the involvement of the university and the commitment of its resources to the problems and concerns of the community. While universities alone cannot resolve these dilemmas, nor are they expected to do this alone, they carry an increasing responsibility to become involved where the action is.

In all of this, Title I of the Higher Education Act is seen as one effort, one attempt to relate the university more closely to the needs and problems of society. But in this speaker's view, Title I is only an example of the general direction in which the university, and particularly its extension activities, need to move. This in no way minimizes the importance of the teaching and research functions of the university. This in no way minimizes the importance of the range of extension and continuing education functions of the university. In this view, the university has the capacity to respond and the responsibility to apply new and accumulated knowledge to society's needs. The only question is how do we respond without jeopardizing our other commitments.

Let me move on to the second point--while community development is not the only approach to university involvement in community-centered activity it is a particularly appropriate way in which the university can address itself to the problems of society and relate its resources to society's needs. Community development is defined in many ways but I like a very simple one which appears in Roland Warren's book, The Community in America. Here community development is defined as "the deliberate attempt by community people to work together to guide the future of their communities, and the development of a corresponding set of techniques for assisting community people in such a process."[7] Some of the points of emphasis or crucial elements in the process are the direct participation of the people themselves in goal setting, their direct participation in goal implementation, use of rational methods of problem solving, an organized, coordinated approach that attempts to involve the entire community, the use of outside experts and resources only as needed, and emphasis on the intangible effects on the people and the community's interactions; the process as well as the projects.

In all of this, the involvement of the people themselves in their own decision making is paramount; it is a people-centered process. Through community development agents or university extension personnel with specialized training in community development consultation services are offered to community groups with additional specialized resources available as the specific needs arise. Group study and decision making is an educational process in itself calling for a high degree of sophistication; an ability to work with groups around goal setting and goal implementation.

The direction in which the community moves is up to the community. The university responds in appropriate situations and as it is called upon to respond. This is community service of the highest order. It is not peddling a packaged program to see who will buy. It is the people themselves deciding what they need and then requesting specific resources from the university. To be sure, this puts a greater strain on the university and can lead to many requests which do not fit within department or professional lines. It does not mean, however, that we can or should respond to every request. No university has that wide a range of resources. No university can be all things to all people. It does suggest a new delivery system. It does suggest bringing our expertise, our abilities to bear when they are needed and where they are needed. This is being relevant to the needs of society. This is in the finest tradition of university outreach.

My third point is that all universities have a responsibility to the society of which they are a part. While all universities should, and to varying degrees do, recognize this responsibility, state universities carry a more specific charge to apply their know-how to the social and economic problems of their particlar state.

In a recent long-range planning report issued by the University of Missouri, two of the four basic guidelines for extension and continuing education point out first that programs will be based upon the expressed needs of Missouri citizens and, second, there will be increased allocations of resources to social and community problems, with emphasis on urban areas.[8]

In what I have said so far there is a danger in

interpreting my statements to mean that community development is the major way in which the university is related to the community. This, of course, is not so. It is fully realized that a host of other activities, relationships and programs are going on and will continue between individual faculty, departments, and whole campuses on one hand and community groups, communities, regions, and perhaps whole states on the other hand. It is where people have not yet decided what resources they may need or want from the university, where communities have not had an opportunity to come together and decide priorities, where no mechanism for conducting joint enterprises has been arrived at that community development can make its major impact. Where process is stressed and program and projects evolve from the process, where action grows out of joint study, where involvement of people leads to group decision and action--these are the situations where community development makes a major contribution.

For illustrative pruposes, I wish to speak briefly of the community development program at the University of Missouri. My own association with the University has been short enough so that most of what I have to say reflects on the fine work and on the foresight and determination of people who have preceded me at the University of Missouri.

The full story on community development at Missouri needs to be written and documented not because it is a success story as such, but it is perhaps the most comprehensive community development program at any American University. For this reason it needs to be spelled out in detail. One of my greatest hopes, and one that I share with my colleagues, is

that over the next year or two we can prepare and publish the story of community development at this University.

It is quite fitting that community development at Missouri started as an extension function. An increasing number of towns, cities and counties began requesting help from the University on community problems, on matters of civic improvement and community development. No specific discipline was called upon and general consultation was obviously needed. From this rather simple beginning in 1957 a very limited staff began offering community development consulting and continuing education services to communities, upon request, on a wide range of civic concerns. These consultants were not there to give answers, but they were able to help the communities in ways they themselves could go about getting answers. As needed, other university resources were called into the picture. This work with communities on the use of community development for improving community systems and providing community development training for interested citizens showed there was a tremendous demand for learning experience in community work and highlighted the fact that so few professionals were trained in this process.

The University now has twenty-six authorized community development positions as part of the university-wide extension program. Each community development agent lives and works in a three to five county area. On the Columbia campus we offer a Master of Science in Community Development through the Department of Regional and Community Affairs. This is an academic Department and part of the School of Social and Community Services. We have a faculty of fifteen,

with two positions open at the present time. This faculty has the responsibility for the master's program as well as providing initial training, in-service training and backup services for the community development agents in the field. At present we have some fifty students in either the two year master's program or in the one year diploma program for international students. Through special urban provlem solving funds made available by the University in July, 1968, we have established the beginning of an urban community development program with one community development specialist in Kansas City and a second in the greater St. Louis area.

The community development agents carry out a wide range of activities based on the concerns and issues within their particular area. The general philosophy and process of community development are constant, the content is variable. These agents consult with groups on matters of organization; on leadership identification, training and functioning; on resources available and procedures for securing these resources; on community study and survey procedures. They raise important questions, encourage groups to look at alternatives and implications. The community development agents relate to and work closely with other extension staff, with state personnel, with special program people, and with many other professionals.

And what is the goal of all this community development activity? Community improvement, community advancement as determined by the citizens themselves. And community, as I use it here, may be a town, city, county, region or any other bundle of resources and population that makes up a viable unit. A process too has been initiated which attempts to

involve as many people as possible in group decision-making and action. The process is based on certain value positions including the position that community action should be determined by the citizens of the community; that decisions made in this way tend to be supported and carried out; that through this process people gain an increasing willingness and ability to tackle other and more complex problems. The result may be a water district, a regional planning commission, a new industry, a consolidated school district, a community college or any one of a hundred other concrete accomplishments.

Broadly speaking the goal of community development is the good community. Lloyd Ohlin has listed five characteristics of the "good community:"

> "1. The physical resources to maintain a healthy, satisfying and constructive life for all age groups."
>
> "2. An integrated structure of opportunities for learning and performing social roles."
>
> "3. Sufficient residential stability to encourage the development of strong institutions, skilled leadership, and effective networks of social interaction and decision-making."
>
> "4. Active social and political participation by residents in those processes of decision-making which affect their interests."
>
> "5. Exercise of responsibility and control over local institutions."[9]

In focusing on certain topics, others must be ignored or passed over lightly. In my emphasis on the extension role of the university in community development I have given almost no attention to two university roles that are particularly important in

a relatively new professional field. I am referring here to the need for research and the development of practice theory and the need for professional education for those seeking a career in community development. With these needs and the outreach possibilities the role of the university in community development holds great potential. No other institution is better equipped to carry out these research, education and extension functions. The most important task now is to turn this potential into performance.

NOTES

[1]D. Mack Easton, "The Situation Around Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965." Paper presented to Community Development Division, NUEA, Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 24, 1967. 13 pp. (Mimeographed).

[2]Thurman J. White. "Title One and Community Development." The NUEA Spectator, 34, 1 (October-November, 1968), 10-14.

[3]Easton, op. cit., 8.

[4]White, op. cit., 14.

[5]James T. Bonnen, "The Public Affairs Role of the University of the Last Third of Our Century." In a speech to the University of Missouri Annual Extension Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, October 24, 1968. p. 9.

[6]Ibid., p. 8.

[7]Roland Warren, The Community in America. (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963), 20.

[8]See Long Range Planning, University of Missouri, November, 1968.

[9]Lloyd E. Ohlin, "Urban Community Development." Paper presented at The Conference on Socially Handicapped Families, Paris, France, February 10-12, 1964, 9-10.